

Application No.: 09/844,924
Amendment dated: January 26, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: September 26, 2006

REMARKS

By this amendment and remarks, claims 1, 13 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-31 are pending in the application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,497 to Beetcher et al. ("Beetcher") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,512 to Siefert et al. ("Siefert").

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13 and 20 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite the step of "enabling an electronic device to run a controlled application with a single encrypted record containing only a copied serial number and a first authorization level, wherein said first authorization level is assigned to said electronic device and authorizes said electronic device to run controlled applications having authorization levels not exceeding said first authorization level, wherein said electronic device is backdoor enabled." Claim 13 has been amended to recite the step of "executing an application on an electronic device, said application having controlled attributes, wherein said electronic device is backdoor enabled." Similarly, claim 20 has been amended to recite the step of "enabling an electronic device to run a controlled application with a single encrypted record containing only a copied serial number and a first authorization level, wherein said first authorization level is assigned to said electronic device and authorizes said electronic device to run controlled applications having authorization levels not exceeding said first authorization level, wherein said electronic device is backdoor enabled."

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 20, is directed to a method and system of securing a handheld computer against backdoor test applications to maintain the integrity of wireless networks which the handheld computer is connected to. The handheld computer is backdoor enabled so that backdoor test applications may be executed on the devices. Authorization and authentication of proper backdoor applications is provided by

specifying certain handheld computers as testing devices and encrypting the serial number of that device and the authorization level on a single record and storing the record in the handheld computer.

The Examiner primary reference, Beetcher, is fundamentally different. Beetcher is directed to distributing software which inherently has no entitlement to run on any device whether the device is backdoor enabled or not. After the software has been distributed, a single key contains a charge group, version bits, keytype bits, machine serial bits, and product entitlement bits (See Fig. 2). Such overhead of bits on the entitlement key is not necessary in the present invention. The present invention contemplates a single record containing only a copy of the serial number and the authorization level.

Siefert does not overcome the shortcomings of the Beetcher reference. Siefert is directed to assigning key codes for computer resources. Siefert also provides for numerous fields in the key code, where such overhead is impractical on a handheld computer with limited resources (see Fig. 4). Therefore, Siefert does not disclose or suggest “a single encrypted record” containing “only a copied serial number and a first authorization level.”

There is no prima facie case of obviousness. Even if the combination were proper, the proposed combination of Beetcher and Siefert is not the same as the claimed invention since neither reference discloses an electronic device which is backdoor enabled. The prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Since a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13 and 20 are allowable over the cited references. Claims 2-12, 14-19 and 21-31, which depend from claims 1, 13 and 20 respectively, are similarly allowable.

Application No.: 09/844,924
Amendment dated: January 26, 2007
Reply to Office Action of: September 26, 2006

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: January 26, 2007

By: _____
Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860